U.S. Application No. 09/558,239 - Filed: April 24, 2000

Amendment Dated: April 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 21, 2004

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 21, 2004, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, and 5-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this paper, Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out that which the Applicants regard as the invention. Further, Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice. For the reasons set forth fully below, Claims 1, 2, and 6-14, as now amended, are considered to be allowable.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,595,823) in view of Chen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,582,917). The Examiner has gone thorough extensive (and accurate) calculations to show that the prior art references disclose aluminum oxides and alkaline earth metal oxides or alkaline earth metal hydroxides or combinations thereof within the ranges claimed by Applicants as their invention, and that the motive to ad a poly(C₁₋₆ alkyl)siloxane polymer to the composition of Chen, et al. ('823) would be obvious. Applicants have herein amended the claimed ranges of the combination of alkaline earth metal oxides and alkaline earth metal hydroxides, wherein the alkaline earth metal hydroxides include at least 6 parts by weight of calcium hydroxide per 100 parts of the fluorocarbon random copolymer and the alkaline earth metal oxides include at least 3 parts by weight of magnesium oxide per 100 parts of the fluorocarbon random copolymer. As previously noted, these ranges are supported in the specification at page 11. Similar calculations, for the proposed claimed ranges, to those shown by the Examiner clearly demonstrate that such ranges for the aluminum oxides and alkaline earth metal oxides or alkaline earth metal hydroxides or combinations thereof to be significantly outside the comparable ranges of the prior art (see Tables below).

U.S. Application No. <u>09/558,239</u> - Filed: <u>April 24, 2000</u>

Amendment Dated: April 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 21, 2004

(A) High limit of MgO + $Ca(OH)_2$

	D (density)	Wt	Vol	Vol%	
Polymer	1.82	100	54.95	77.34%	
MgO	3.58	3	0.84	1.18%	= 4.94%
Ca(OH) ₂	2.24	6	2.67	3.76%	
Al ₂ O ₃	3.97	50	12.59	17.71%	

(Total 71.05)

(B) Low limit of MgO + $Ca(OH)_2$

	D (density)	Wt	Vol	Vol%	
Polymer	1.82	100	54.95	58.62%	
MgO	3.58	3	0.84	0.87%	
Ca(OH) ₂	2.24	6	2.67	2.86%	= 3.73%
Al ₂ O ₃	3.97	140	35.26	37.62%	

(Total 93.72)

Accordingly, Applicants' invention would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the cited references either individually or in any proper combination. Therefore, independent Claim 1, and Claims 2, and 5-14, dependent directly or indirectly thereon, when amended as proposed, should now be allowed.

Applicants are not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

As now presented, this application is believed to be in condition for favorable reconsideration and early allowance, and such actions are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 24,637

Lawrence P. Kessler/DN Rochester, NY 14653-7103 Telephone: (585) 253-0123 Facsimile: (585) 726-0894